

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached drawing sheet includes a new sheet to be added after FIG. 4. The new sheet includes FIG. 5. In FIG. 5, a two-dimensional antenna is illustrated including a coil with windings extending substantially in a plane perpendicular to a surface of a substrate, and a further coil with windings in a plane substantially parallel to the surface of the substrate. Support for FIG. 5 is drawn from claims 1 and 19, which were filed with the original application, and the subject matter described at page 9, lines 22-25 of the original specification.

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-12, 17 and 19 were rejected. Additionally, the drawings were objected to. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claim 1 is amended to include material drawn from claim 19, and is further amended as suggested by the Examiner. The preambles of claims 2 - 17 are amended to match the amended preamble of claim 1. Claim 12 is amended to address antecedent basis issues. Claim 19 is canceled, as the limitations of claim 19 are included in amended claim 1.

### Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for failing to show every feature described in claim 12, “e.g. two coils must be shown.” Claim 12, however, does not recite two coils. Claim 12 recites a first conductor element and a second conductor element, both of which are clearly shown in FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, FIG. 1C, and FIG. 1D. The two conductors are labeled in these figures as 6a, 6b, 8a, and 8b.

Claim 19 did recite a second coil. The “further coil” of claim 19 is incorporated into amended claim 1. To illustrate the further coil, now included in claim 1, a new sheet showing FIG. 5 is included with this response. FIG. 5 depicts a two-dimensional antenna having a coil and a further coil. Support for FIG. 5 is drawn from claim 19, which was filed with the original application, and the subject matter described at page 9, lines 22-25, of the original specification.

### Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the “conductive track” recited in claim 5. The rule 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1) requires the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable. In other words, the meaning of the terms in the claims must be

ascertainable, and antecedent basis is simply one way of providing support, but antecedent basis is not the only way to provide support for the limitations of the claim. Further, MPEP 608.01(o) recognizes that an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed. Hence, the MPEP also recognizes that the language of the claims does not have to be explicitly, or literally, supported by the description of the specification.

In the present application, a conductive track on a chip is described on page 3, lines 19-32, of the originally filed specification. Additionally, originally filed claims 4, 5, and 15 include the indicated language related to a conductive track on a chip. Moreover, the claims are part of the specification. Although the detailed description section of the specification may not use the exact same terminology as the claims, Applicants submit that the specification otherwise supports the indicated language, at least because the originally filed claims include the indicated language and are part of the originally filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

If the Examiner persists in this line of reasoning, Applicants would consider amending the specification to include at least some of the language from one or more of claims 4, 5, and 15. While such an amendment to the specification would be supported by the language of the originally filed claims, it would seem to be an unnecessary exercise in light of the language of the originally filed claims. Nevertheless, Applicants are amenable to resolving this issue raised by the Examiner.

#### Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objects to claims 1 and 12 for the following informalities. In particular, claims 1 and 12 are objected to for using the limitation “deposited” since the term is “closely related to fabrication terminology.” Applicants do not agree that the use of the term “deposited” to describe a location of an element is objectionable in a claim relating to a device. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants amend claims 1 and 12 as suggested by the Examiner to replace “deposited” with “provided.”

Claim 12 is also objected to for lack of antecedent basis for several elements of the claim and for disagreement between the preamble and limitations of the claim. Claim 12 is amended in the preamble to clarify dependence on claim 1. Claim 12 is further amended to recite the chip and the integrated circuit, which have antecedent basis in claim 1.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10-12, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by NmH Hsieh et al. (European Pat. No. 0,725,407, hereinafter NmH Hsieh). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over NmH Hsieh for the reasons provided below.

#### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “a two-dimensional antenna comprising a coil . . . extending in a plane substantially perpendicular to the surface of the substrate, and a further coil . . . in a plane substantially parallel to the surface” (emphasis added).

In contrast, NmH Hsieh does not disclose a two-dimensional antenna with one coil in a plane substantially perpendicular to the surface of the substrate and a further coil in a plane substantially parallel to the surface. In the portion of the Office Action relating to the rejection of claim 19, the Office Action cites column 7, lines 11-15, and FIG. 7 of NmH Hsieh as purportedly disclosing a two-dimensional antenna. NmH Hsieh, however, merely discloses coils in or parallel to the same plane. NmH Hsieh, column 7, lines 8-9 (“Shown are two coils separated by an insulating film but intertwined around the same ferromagnetic core” (emphasis added)).

The coils described in NmH Hsieh do not include any windings in a plane substantially parallel to the surface of the substrate as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, since all of the windings in NmH Hsieh are in or parallel to the same plane (which is not substantially parallel to the surface of the substrate), the coils in NmH Hsieh would be unable to act as a two-dimensional antenna, as recited in claim 1.

For the reasons presented above, NmH Hsieh does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because NmH Hsieh does not disclose a two-dimensional antenna

with one coil in a plane substantially perpendicular to the surface of the substrate and a further coil in a plane substantially parallel to the surface, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 1 is patentable over NmH Hsieh because NmH Hsieh does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims 2, 5, 7, 10-12, and 17

Claims 2, 5, 7, 10-12, and 17 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2, 5, 7, 10-12, and 17 are allowable based on an allowable base claim.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 26, 2008

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111